REMARKS

The Examiner's Action mailed on April 20, 2005, has been received and its contents carefully considered. Additionally attached to this Amendment is a Petition for an Extension of Time, extending the period for response to August 20, 2005.

In this Amendment, Applicants have editorially amended independent claim 1, and canceled claims 10-18. Claim 1 is the independent claim, and claims 1-9 remain pending in the application. For at least the following reasons, it is submitted that this application is in condition for allowance.

The Examiner has objected to claims 10-18. Because these claims have been canceled, this objection has been rendered moot.

The Examiner has rejected the claims as being obvious over *Miyashita et al.* (USP 5,558,015) in view of *Chou* (USP 6,482,742). It is submitted that these claims are *prima facie* patentably distinguishable over the cited references for at least the following reasons.

Claim 1 is directed to a uniform pressing apparatus which includes, *inter alia*, a housing having an opening and being formed with a first flange which extends in a first direction from a periphery of the opening. The apparatus further includes a first carrier unit which is formed with a second flange which extends in a second direction opposite to the first direction, thereby allowing the second

flange to be movably attached to the first flange to form surface contact therebetween such that the first carrier unit moves with the movement of the housing. This claim also recites a second carrier unit for carrying a substrate and a uniform pressing unit which comprises a closed flexible membrane and fluid filling the closed flexible membrane. Moreover, a driving unit is provided in which the second flange is made to separate from the first flange via the contact between an imprint mold and a moldable layer. This claimed invention has the advantages discussed in Applicants' specification, and is neither disclosed nor suggested by the cited combination of references.

Miyashita et al. disclose a hot press with a pressure vessel which uniformly distributes pressure to a work piece. As shown in figure 1, this reference discloses providing upper and lower bolsters 7, 6 and forming a tubular ring 13 on the upper bolster 7 and a tubular ring 16 on the lower bolster 6. This reference also discloses providing a bracket 15 connected to the tubular ring 16, and which is movable by pneumatic cylinders 14.

The Examiner's Action has equated the tubular ring 13 as being a housing as recited in Applicants' claim 1, and has equated the bracket 15 as being a first flange, as also recited within claim 1. The Examiner's Action has further equated the upper and lower bolsters 6, 7 as being first and second carrier units, as recited within claim 1. However, it is initially noted that the tubular ring 13, which the

Examiner's Action has equated as being a housing, does not have the bracket 15 formed thereon. Instead, this reference discloses that it is tubular ring 16 which has the bracket 15 attached thereto. Moreover, it is noted that bracket 15 does not extend in a first direction from a periphery of any opening, as recited by claim 1. Furthermore, it is noted that the Examiner's Action has not even addressed Applicants' claimed second flange, which Applicants' claim 1 recites is formed on the first carrier unit. Moreover, it is also noted that the bracket 15, which the Examiner's Action has equated to being a first flange, does not move into contact or out of contact with any disclosed feature, much less a second flange as would be required by Applicants' independent claim 1. Again, the Examiner's Action has not even addressed this particular feature from Applicants' claims. Further, the secondary reference does not overcome these above-noted deficiencies. Therefore, the Examiner's Action has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness against Applicants' independent claim 1, and the claims dependent therefrom. It is thus requested that these claims all be allowed and that these rejections be withdrawn.

It is submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Such action and the passing of this case to issue are requested.

Should the Examiner feel that a conference would help to expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is hereby invited to contact the undersigned counsel to arrange for such an interview.

Should the remittance be accidentally missing or insufficient, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge the fee to our Deposit Account No. 18-0002, and advise us accordingly.

Respectfully submitted,

August 3, 2005

Date

Robert H. Berdo, Jr.

Registration No. 38,075 RABIN & BERDO, PC

Customer No. 23995

Telephone: 202-371-8976 Facsimile: 202-408-0924

RHB:vm